

UNITED STA SEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/507,108 02/17/00 SWENSON М 54682 USA 6A **EXAMINER** QM32/1012 Mueting Raasch & Gebhardt PA LEWIS, K PO Box 581415 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Minneapolis MN 55458 3761 DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

10/12/01

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/507,108

Applicant(s)

Swenson

Examiner

Kim M. Lewis

Art Unit 3761



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the corres		
A SHI THE N - Exten aft - If the be - If NO co - Failur - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Is sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Ceter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days considered timely. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory mmunication. The to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the rend patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, cation. s, a reply within the statutory minimum period will apply and will expire SIX (cy statute, cause the application to become	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status 1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/3/00, 1	10/10/00 and 1/9/01	,, :	
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This ac	This action is non-final.		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-35</u>	is/are	e pending in the application.	
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/ar	e withdrawn from consideration.	
5) 🗌	Claim(s)		is/are allowed.	
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1-35		is/are rejected.	
7) 🗌	Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restric	ction and/or election requirement.	
	tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/ard The proposed drawing correction filed on The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	is: a) approved	b)□ disapproved.	
13) ☐ a) ☐	under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign particle. All b) Some* c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have compared to the priority documents have copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have application from the International Burden the attached detailed Office action for a list of the Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestice.	ve been received. ve been received in Application Notes to the documents have been received in the eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). ne certified copies not received.	No In this National Stage	
Attachm		18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper	· No(s)	
~	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application		
. —	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4,6,7	20) X Other: Detailed Action		

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The preliminary amendment filed on 2/17/00 has been received and made of record in the application file wrapper. The changes to the specification have been made as requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 7/3/00, 10/10/01 AND 1/9/01 have been received and made of record in the application file wrapper.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "19" (see page 8, line 13 of the specification). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 3761

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18, 19, 22-27, 29-32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,409,472 ("Rawlings et al.").

As regards claim 1, Rawlings et al. disclose an adhesive polymeric foam dressing comprising a liquid impervious water vapor permeable film material (col. 12, lines 64-65 and col. 8, lines 65-66) having directly bonded thereto an absorbent foam. Rawlings et al. further disclose apt foams constructed from "polyurethane, carboxylated butadiene styrene rubber, polyacrylate or like foam. Such foams may be made of hydrophillic materials *per se* or my be treated to render them hydrophillic, for example, with surfactants", (col. 6, line 58-67). Similarly, the applicant on page 6, lines 24+ disclose the same absorbent foams. As such, the foams of Rawlings et al. perform the same (*i.e.* nonswellable).

As regards claims 2-9, 24-27 and 29, the applicant fails to disclose in both the specification and claims anything that would chemically or physically alter the disclosed absorbent foam and polymeric film. As such, the examiner contends that since the same materials are used in constructing the medical article of the instant and in the wound dressing of Rawlings et al., the wound dressing of Rawlings et al. has similar wet and dry MVTRs, would absorb similar amounts of NaCl, and would have similar increases in volume.

As regards claim 11, note col. 9, lines 5-20, which discloses the permeability of the film.

As regards claim 12, note col. 9, lines 47-48, which discloses the thickness of the film.

Art Unit: 3761

As regards claims 13 and 14, since the materials used in Rawlings et al. are the same and the applicant fails to claim anything that would chemically or physically alter the absorbent foam, the examiner contends the foam has the same characteristics.

As regards claims 15 and 16, note col. 6, lines 42-47 and lines 58-59, which discloses the type of foam used.

As regards claims 18 and 19, note Fig. 1, which discloses the film extends beyond the periphery of the foam and an adhesive therearound.

As regards claim 22, note col. 12, lines 38-45, which discloses how the foam is adhered to the film.

As regards claim 23, note the abstract, which discloses the device is a wound dressing.

As regards claim 30, note the rejection of claim 1, *supra*.

As regards claims 31 and 32, note Fig. 1, which discloses the film extends beyond the periphery and an adhesive material therearound.

As regards claim 34, note the rejection of claim 22.

As regards claim 35, note the Abstract, which discloses the device of Rawlings et al. is a wound dressing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3761

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 10, 17, 20, 21, 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawlings et al. In view of U.S. Patent No. 5,000,172 ("Ward").

As regards claims 10, 20, 28 and 33, Rawlings et al. fail to disclose that the film layer comprises one or more layers. However, Ward teaches it is known to construct backing layers (film layers) with additional film layers (nonwoven) for support. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Rawlings et al. by constructing the film layer from one or more layers for additional support, as suggested by Ward.

As regards claim 17, Rawlings et al. fail to disclose graphics on the film material.

However, Ward teaches it is known to provide graphics on the film layer of a bandage in order to monitor the size of a wound. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Rawlings et al. with the addition of graphics on the film layer, as suggested by Ward, in order to monitor the size of a wound.

As regards claim 21, Ward discloses that the additional layer is adhesively bonded to the backing layer. Ward fails to teach the adhesive used is a fibrous adhesive. Absent a critical teaching and/or a showing of unexpected results derived from the use of a fibrous adhesive, the examiner contend that the type of adhesive used is an obvious design choice which does not patentably distinguish applicant's invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/507108

Art Unit: 3761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim M. Lewis whose telephone number is (703) 308-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 5:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3590.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

kml

October 5, 2001

KIM M. LEWIS

Page 6